

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :

CRIMINAL CASE

Plaintiff(s) Case No. 2:18-cr-00352-HB-3

v.

JUL 12 2019 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

May 2, 2019

SHARIF EL-BATTOUTY KATEBARKMAN, Clerk ime 9:37 a.m. to 2:23 p.m. Dep. Clerk

Defendant(s),

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 5 BEFORE THE HONORABLE HARVEY BARTLE, III UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Seth Schlessinger

U.S. Attorney's Office

615 Chestnut Street, Ste. 1250

Philadelphia, PA 19106

For the Plaintiff:

Lauren E. Britsch

U.S. Department of Justice

Criminal Division

1400 New York Ave, NW, 6th Floor

Washington, DC 20005

For the Plaintiff:

Kaylynn N. Snoop

Department of Justice 1400 New York Ave, NW Washington, DC 20005

For Defendant Name:

Matthew David Lee

Fox Rothschild, LLP

2000 Market Street, 20th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Court Recorder/ESR:

Jimmy Cruz

Clerk's Office

U.S. District Court

Deputy Clerk:

Kristin R. Makely



Transcription Service:

Precise Transcript 45 N. Broad Street Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

(Proceedings started at 9:37 a.m.)

DEPUTY CLERK KRISTIN MAKELY: All rise. Oyez! Oyez!

Oyez! All men or persons having anything to say before the Honorable Harvey Bartle, III, Judge for the United States

District Court in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania may at present appear and they shall be heard. God save the United States and this Honorable Court.

THE COURT: Good morning members of the jury, you may be seated. May I see counsel briefly.

Juror No. 2 called in this morning and said that her car had broken down yesterday, and that she has no way of getting from her home in Northampton County to the Lansdale Station, which is about an hour from her home. I've excused her, and I replaced Alternate No. 1 in her place. Secondly, I, I told Counsel earlier this morning I've decided to allow the exhibits which have been admitted to go out with the jury, and they would be on a laptop. Am I correct?

MALE SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And thirdly, I wanted to mention that I do allow the superseding indictment to go out with the jury. Anything further at this time?

MALE SPEAKER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Britch, you're going to make the closing -- yes (indiscernible).

	Government - Closing Argument 4
1	MS. BRITSCH: Yes.
2	MR. LEE: May I just may I note my objection
3	THE COURT: Absolutely.
4	MR. LEE: to the Government providing the laptop
5	computers to the Jurors?
6	THE COURT: You may. Objection overruled.
7	MS. BRITSCH: Thank you, Judge.
8	THE COURT: Ms. Britsch, you make closing argument
9	on behalf of the Government.
10	MS. BRITSCH: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: You may turn the podium around, if you
12	wish.
13	MS. BRITSCH: Alright. Thank you, Your Honor. I'll
14	leave it here, if that's okay with the Court.
15	THE COURT: Alright, that's fine.
16	MS. BRITSCH: Thank you. How would Mr. Sharif El-
17	Battouty describe himself? I'm basically awesome. I can get
18	any girl naked. L-O-L. I had them use any objects. L-O-L.
19	Got tits, bloody pussy, pissing, first day talking to her.
20	His words, not mine. And, these are just three of the
21	thousands of chats the Defendant posted on the Cam Girls and
22	Thot Counselors servers. Chats about minor girls, children
23	who are nothing more than playing pieces. Pawns in the
24	Defendant's little game. To the Defendant and his buddies on
25	Discord, these girls were like baseball cards, to be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

collected and traded for their own twisted sexual pleasure. But ladies and gentlemen, this is not a game because these are real children, real girls targeted by the Defendant. Girls, some who hadn't even reached puberty, manipulated, coerced, and directed to engage in sex acts on camera. The Defendant and his Discord buddies exploited their youth, their, their vulnerability, and they stole their innocence. And, unfortunately the Defendant and his co-conspirators were remarkably successful. They created thousands of videos depicting child after child after child in their community, achieving wins. Nearly 150 of these children identified so Think about that number, 150 girls, children, and many more not yet identified by the FBI. And, the Defendant and his Discord buddies, they shared videos of these real children on the internet, where they will preserved for all time. The sexual exploitation of these children will never, ever go away.

The Defendant is charged with two counts, that both involve joint criminal activity and, as you now know, that joint criminal activity occurred on Discord. Now, Discord is a regular chatting application that can be used by you or me for a regular, legal purpose. However, the Defendant and his buddies developed their own little corner of Discord dedicated to their illegal purpose, trading child pornography. And, that little corner started on Cam Girls,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and developed and ended on Thot Counselors. There, they surrounded themselves with like-minded people who shared their sexual interest in children. And, they thought they could be safe there. They thought they could keep out the "normies," normal people. They caught -- thought that they could elude the FBI and law enforcement. And, they created and organized and developed a community specifically dedicated to advertising child pornography, and a very particular type of child pornography at that. Child pornography showing little girls on web camera taking off their clothes, exposing their genitals, masturbating. Children directed to insert objects, plungers, markers, brushes, nail clippers, into their vaginas, all so the Defendant and his buddies could fap, masturbate. Masturbate to middle-schoolers, some still in elementary school, girls as young as eight years old. And, this occurred every single day for two years.

Now, even by the standards of the group, this group dedicated to child pornography, the Defendant, Fritos, was especially prolific. He constantly talked about his successes, and sometimes his failures in getting girls to do what he wanted on web camera. His specialty was getting girls to stick whatever they could find into their vaginas. His strategy was to manipulate the girls by catfishing, pretending to be someone else, to deceive them and coerce

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### Government - Closing Argument

them. And, you saw the Defendant also used a game, a game to manipulate the girls, entice the girls, to engage in progressively more intense, lewd, disgusting sex acts. you saw that the Defendant was proud of his accomplishments. He bragged on Discord about being elite. Is this really something to be proud of? Is it a skill for a grown man to dupe a child to insert a plunger into her vagina? Now, you not only saw the Defendant's words on Discord, but you heard the Defendant's words in a recorded statement to FBI Special Agent Matthew Deragon and, in that statement, he admits to being Fritos. He admits that Cam Girls and Thot Counselors were dedicated to child pornography, according to him child pornography involving girls as young as 13. And, he admits that he was active on these servers for about two years. And, you also see this in the Discord IP address records that Verizon connected to the house that the Defendant lived in in New York, Fritos' activity spanning back to 2016 and up until July 2018, when he was arrested. For two years, the Defendant sat here, in a bedroom, in his parents' house, at this computer, all day targeting children -- two years of producing child pornography, advertising child pornography, trading child pornography.

Now, for these crimes, the Defendant is charged with two counts. Count one is engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, and count two is conspiracy to advertise child

7

## Government - Closing Argument

pornography. I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about how the evidence the Government has presented to you fits into the elements of each of these crimes. Later, the Judge is going to instruct you on the law and what the Government is required to prove for each of these crimes. Now, if I say anything different than what the Judge instructs you on the law, you should ignore me and follow the Judge's instructions. And, the same goes for Defense Counsel. If he tells you anything different on the law than what the Court instructs you, you should ignore him and follow the Court's instructions.

The first charge is engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, and it has three essential elements. First, that the Defendant distributed, transported, advertised, or received child pornography three separate times, that this involved more than one victim, and that he did it in concert with three or more people.

Let's first talk about what it means to distribute, transport, or receive child pornography. These crimes have similar elements, so I'll talk about them together. The first element is that the Defendant knowingly transported, distributed, or received an image or video. The second is that that image or video involved a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and the image or video shows that sexually explicit conduct. The fourth is — the third

element is that the Defendant knew it was minor in that image or, or video. And finally, that the Defendant used a means or facility of interstate commerce to distribute, transport, or receive that video.

I'm going to take that last element first, because there's no dispute on the issue of interstate commerce in this case. First, there's a stipulation, which simply means that the Government and the Defense agree that Discord operated on the internet, and the internet is a means or facility of interstate commerce. And, you heard testimony from different witnesses, Special Agent Johns, Timothy Friel, that Discord operated on the internet, and that it had users across the country, and also in foreign countries, and it had users, Mr. Timothy Friel, right here in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

There are also a couple of definitions that apply to these crimes. First, the law defines a minor as anyone under the age of 18. Second, the law defines sexually explicit conduct, and that includes actual or simulated masturbation, and you've seen many videos of children masturbating with their hands or inserting objects, plungers, markers, brushes, into their vaginas, masturbation. And, it also includes lascivious exhibition of the genitals. Is there really any question that the images and videos traded on Discord were lascivious, that they were lewd, that they were designed to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

elicit a sexual response in the viewer, the Defendant and his co-conspirators who fapped and masturbated to these videos.

Videos of 8, 10, 11, 12-year-old children? The videos that have come into evidence are lascivious.

Now, as part of the Discord enterprise, the Defendant himself transported, distributed, and received child pornography many, many times, and we've highlighted some examples of those in this case. Let's start with Fritos' trademark, gif files. You've heard a lot about these gif files in this case, those short movies, about three seconds, that the Defendant created. And, the evidence in this case includes 11 different child pornography gifs that the Defendant created and he distributed and transported by uploading them to the Discord servers, uploading them for his fellow users to view and download. And, he bragged about his gifs. Here, I think my gif obsession is better than your meme one, with a smiley crying emoji. And again, Fritos, L-O-L, I had them use any objects. And, you saw many of those objects in the gifs. Again, on Thot Counselors, in the Behind The Curtain, that locked channel that Fritos had access to, six more gifs depicting children inserting objects or their hands into their vaginas, masturbating.

The Defendant also advertised child pornography on Discord. As the Judge will instruct you later, both offering child pornography, as well as soliciting or seeking child

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pornography, counts as advertising child pornography under this law. And, you saw the Defendant commit this offense by making posts on Discord, posts that request particular videos of particular victims in the undercover screenshots. Here, in the back, back end Discord records, a request for Alyssa Kentt or Madie, win. And, the evidence shows what win means in this community. Win, successfully getting a minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct, masturbation on web camera. And, this is the Defendant requesting that video. Another time he asks for a person with Alyssa Kentt, win, to PM, private message, him. And, he also advertises his unseen Acacia. Again, anyone have Skypes though? I'll drop -- oh, Ava Skripes, Skypes, a particular victim, and I'll drop Grace and Amaya, offering a trade. And, you saw on his external hard drive that he had folders dedicated to Alyssa Kentt and Acacia in the subfolder girls I know. And you saw Acacia, a real minor, exploited by this man.

The Defendant also advertised child pornography by offering to make gifs and asking what types of gifs he should make. And, this is another example of a way he advertised child pornography. Here, Fritos, who should I make gifs of? And, a fellow user responds, Omegal wins. And, what does Fritos do in response to that request? He uploads gifs of his Omegal wins.

Lastly, the Defendant also received child

pornography. You heard the Defendant in his recorded interview explain to the on-scene forensic examiner, who is walking through his external hard drive, that the drive included a bunch of downloaded stuff. And, one of those videos is a video of Lilly and Rayann. You saw Discord user Choad, post on one of the Discord Cam Girls/Thot Counselors rooms, a LiveMe M3U8 link to that file. And, this M3U8 link is one of the primary ways that the users of Discord advertise and share child pornography with each other. And, you heard that this video of Lilly and Rayann was found on the Defendant's external hard drive inside the LiveMe folder. And, you heard Agent Randal from Tex -- Texas tell you that these are real girls. Rayann, who was only 11 years old, and Lilly, who is only 10.

The next element of the first charge, engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, is that the incidents involved more than one victim. The gifs that you've seen depict at least 11 different minors. There's also the video of Lilly and Rayann, two more minors. There are the offers and requests for Amaya, Alyssa Kentt, Acacia, Ava, Madie, Grace, and so many others. Several more than one minor involved in these crimes.

The last element of a child exploitation enterprise is that the Defendant committed these offenses in concert with three or more persons. Similarly, the first element of

conspiracy to advertise child pornography is that two or more persons agreed to advertise child pornography. These elements, working in concert with each other, and entering into an agreement, are similar, and so I'm going to talk about some of the evidence that supports both of those elements together.

And, as Judge Bartle is going to instruct you, the agreement that is required for a criminal conspiracy doesn't have to be a formal agreement. It doesn't have to be in writing. There doesn't even have to be a formal oral agreement. The members don't have to agree to all the details of how the conspiracy will work or all of the means by which they will accomplish their illegal objective. simply has to be a mutual understanding between one or more person, persons, to engage in advertising child pornography. Now, just thinking from a common sense perspective, what was the point of Thot Counselors and Cam Girls if not to work together to advertise and trade child pornography? That's why these servers existed. These people could've, and sometimes did, exclusively work on their own, engaging oneon-one with children. But they went beyond that, they came together. They joined their efforts on Cam Girls and Thot Counselors so that they could target more children, they could trade material, offer one victim for another, and expand their collective child pornography stashes.

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, they were highly organized to achieve that goal. saw that they had a hierarchy of membership arranged for certain members to have access to certain channels, and others kept out. Here you see it on Thot Counselors, Senior Counsel, Junior Counsel, Sophomore Counsel. You've heard testimony about the different channels that they set up so that they could organize the content based on where it came from, the source, LiveMe channel, Snapchat channel, Periscope channel. And, this setup of hierarchy of members and channels was designed to discourage lurkers, as you heard them called, and encourage active members who would contribute to the community, add more child pornography, provide more victims. They had rules and guidelines that they posted about. They shared tips and tricks. They had conventions about how to post links so that they could avoid detection by Discord and by law enforcement. They talked about how you should label your videos as NN, non-nude, so that people would know if it's non-nude, something they might not be interested in. And here, offering help, tutorials, technical support, so that they can cap and record these girls more efficiently and more effectively.

And, you heard evidence that Cam Girls shut down at some point. Now, when Cam Girls shut down, did this group just disband, scatter off on their own? No. You heard evidence that this group, this mutual understanding, this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

working together, continued server after server, until they ended up on Thot Counselors. You heard both Special Agent Johns and Timothy Friel testify about this migration from Cam Girls, after it shut down, 'til they ultimately ended up on Thot Counselors. Thot Counselors was still operating at the time of the Defendant's arrest.

Their mutual understanding that these servers were about advertising child pornography was apparent in their actions as well. You saw multiple examples of members requesting certain videos, certain victims, posting links asking if anyone had more of this girl. You heard Mr. Timothy Friel explain how he kept that 90-page Word document full of M3U8 links so he could more efficiently and effectively respond to requests from other members and maintain his status in the group. You've seen them strategizing about techniques to get girls on web camera. This one girl responds better to my girl catfish than my boy, for example. They discussed ways for recording and capping the live web camera sessions, and complicated methods for posting these M3U8 links so they could avoid detection and not get shut down. And, they advised each other on how to use JDownloader so they could download many, many child pornography links at one time.

Is there really any question that this mutual understanding was about sharing child pornography of underage

clippers, into their bodies.

girls? The user Dankster summed it up nicely here.

Successful 25 plus dudes lusting after 13-year-old girls.

This could have been their tag line, pedobear, their mascot.

References to panty-less schoolgirls, tweens, 14-year-old,

15-year-old. And, less there be any doubt about their

objective to share underage child pornography, just look at
the videos shared on Discord. Girls, some of whom haven't

even reached puberty, directed to insert plungers, nail

Now, when the Judge instructs you on the elements of conspiracy, you know what he's not going to tell you? He's not going to tell you that the Government has to prove that these co-conspirators met in person. The Judge is not going to tell you that these co-conspirators had to know their real identities. And, it shouldn't surprise any of us that the Defendant never met his co-conspirators in real life, that they never shared personal information like true names, addresses, and phone numbers. First of all, they didn't have Cam Girls and Thot Counselors gave them everything they needed to achieve their objection -- objective. They could communicate with each other in texts about the girls they wanted, they could share links to the child pornography files and links to the live broadcasts where the girls were performing, and they could upload files, gifs, so they could share, transport, and distribute child pornography.

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

would meeting in person have accomplished for them? Nothing, except to risk exposing their real identities and getting caught by law enforcement. And, that's what Mr. Timothy Friel explained to you. Meeting in person would have made no sense in this conspiracy. It would have undermined this conspiracy rather than furthered it. They were trading highly illegal content, and they knew it. It would be simply ridiculous to expect these co-conspirators, whose interest was in trading child pornography on the internet, to meet in person and expose their identities.

Now let's talk a little bit about the Defendant's participation in this conspiracy.

THE COURT: Five more minutes, Ms. Britsch.

MS. BRITSCH: Thank you, Your Honor. There's no question that the Defendant is Fritos, and you saw plenty of activity by Fritos. And, now Mr. Lee spent some time emphasizing that maybe Fritos wasn't the top dog in this conspiracy, but there's no doubt that he was one of the top dogs. He was part of the Senior Counsel. And, one thing you're not going to hear the Judge instruct you is that there is any requirement that the Defendant be a high level member in the conspiracy. In fact, the Defendant — the Judge is going to instruct you on quite the opposite. The Government does not have to prove that about the Defendant. So, don't let the fact that a user like Orlok may have created the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

server distract you from the fact that Fritos was an active and elite member of this server, posting about gifs, uploading those gifs, making requests for re-uploads, asking for win, offering to drop the megaton bomb in response, asking for win in private messages.

And, then there's all the evidence on the Defendant's external hard drive, mounds of child pornography of the exact type sought and shared on Cam Girls and Thot Counselors. Let's also not forget the Defendant talked about catfishing, one of his strategies for getting content from these girls. CF, catfish. He also bragged about his sources on Cam Girls. The sources that he talked about in his interview were those folders on his external hard drive, meufs, my Omegles. He admitted those are the girls he chatted with one-on-one. And, you saw exhibit after exhibit of the hundreds of folders and videos the Defendant had. Sources of these particular gifs that he uploaded were located on his hard drive, video of these two girls from which he made a gif. This gif, as well, the video on his computer. And, Fritos bragged about his sources on Discord. He hoarded all of his "good shit." And, you saw that on his external hard drive.

He also saved these chat conversations with minors.

14 years old -- girl, I was 10, nasty, go to hell. His

response, I thought you were 13. 14 -- 12-year-old, and then

## Government - Closing Argument

finally please stop, I'm only 9. He told Special Agent
Deragon that he saved these chats 'cause he thought they were
funny. Funny? Really? Even a 12-year-old knew this was
gross. A 9-year-old knew it was wrong. And finally, there's
the Defendant's game. Elaborate, detailed slide shows
dedicated to getting minors to engage in progressively more
and more lewd sex acts. You saw evidence of how this
particular line from a game he talked about on Discord, from
the other game, encouraging the children to hump a plush toy.
And, you saw a video of this child on his computer directed
to hump a teddy bear. Is it a coincidence that he's talking
about children's toys, stuffed animals? The Defendant had
multiple videos that were titled to correspond to these
games. Name and age, and the word game.

Fritos worked in concert with his Discord buddies day in and day out for nearly two years. As Agent Johns testified, their joint criminal activity resulted in the victimization of at least 150 identified minors. Real children, not virtual pawns. Victims from across the country who you heard about in this trial. Aubrey, whose mother told you that she was only 12 years old the time her video was shared on the internet. Rayann from Texas, Payton from California, both only 11. And Lilly, who was only 10. To the Defendant, these girls, these real, live children, were playing pieces in his little game. But, this is not a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Government - Closing Argument/Defendant - Closing Argument 20

game. It is a crime, a horrible, horrible crime, that targeted real children. The evidence shows that the Defendant, Fritos, is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Find him guilty.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Lee, you may make a closing on behalf of the Defendant.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the MR. LEE: I'd like to start by repeating something that I said to you in my opening statement earlier this week, and I want to thank you for serving as Jurors in this case. I said in my opening that serving as a Juror is one of the most important things that we do as citizens and as members of society, and I am grateful for your service, and so is Mr. El-Battouty. And I know that serving on a jury can be difficult. It's a time commitment away from your employer or your family, and it's not an easy thing to do, but I thank you all for your commitment to listening to all of the evidence that was presented in this case. And in particular, I know that the evidence that you've seen in this case is often -- it was oftentimes disturbing and offensive, and I understand and I recognize that that fact made it especially difficult to serve on this jury, but I thank you for doing so.

In my opening statement, I also told you that this was a case about someone who sat in front of a computer day

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# Defendant - Closing Argument

after day, night after night and in doing so that person engaged in one-on-one interactions with others, and he read and he posted messages on various Discord server message boards. But in doing these things, he did so alone. He acted for and on behalf of himself, and not for others, and not with others. And, that is fundamentally what this case is about.

The Government, for its part, contends that this case is about a global enterprise, a grand conspiracy of like-minded individuals who were engaged in all manner of illegal activity. But I submit to you that the evidence shows that the Government is incorrect in that regard, and this is a case about a single individual who acted alone. I'd like to start by talking about some of the witnesses who testified in the trial and whose testimony you heard, and I'm going to start with Mr. Timothy Friel. You will recall that Mr. Friel took the witness stand earlier this week, testified, acknowledged that he is a cooperating witness for the Government, he had pleaded guilty already. He is awaiting sentencing by this Court, by Judge Bartle, in two weeks, in this very court room. He will be back in this courtroom in two weeks, standing before Judge Bartle to receive his sentence for the crimes that he has acknowledged he committed.

During Mr. Friel's testimony, you heard that he was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Defendant - Closing Argument

interviewed earlier -- in February of 2018, by Special Agent Daniel Johns, who's here in the courtroom and who testified not once, but twice in this case. Mr. Friel was interviewed by Agent Johns and another FBI agent at his home in Bucks County, and I want to talk about first how that interview of Mr. Friel was conducted by those two FBI agents. You will recall that during my cross-examination, I questioned Mr. Friel. He acknowledged that when these two FBI agents came to his house and interviewed him as part of the execution of a search warrant, they told him that it was FBI policy to advise him of his rights, and they did, in fact, advise him of his rights. And, you will recall that they gave him a whole series of -- they read him his rights. They read him a litany of his rights. He had the right to remain silent, he was told that anything he could say -- that he did say could be used against him in Court, he had the right to talk to a lawyer before the questioning began, he had the right to have a lawyer present while he was questioned by Agent Johns. he couldn't afford a lawyer, the Court would appoint him a lawyer. And lastly, he was told that if he started answering the Agents' questions but decided to stop, he could do so at any time. Mr. Friel acknowledged those rights, but yet continued -- agreed to start answering questions that were posed to him by those Agents. And, you will recall that he lied in response to a direct question by Agent Johns. He was

# Defendant - Closing Argument

asked whether he had ever accessed child pornography over the internet, and he said no. He flat out lied. He got on the witness stand and acknowledged that. There is no dispute that he lied. He, he, he, he he said so himself. But was he charged in his case with lying to the FBI, which is a felony? No, he was not. Instead, Mr. Friel became a cooperating witness for the FBI, and he agreed to plead guilty, albeit to a much more serious crime.

You heard Mr. Friel testify that he's facing an exceedingly long jail sentence for the crimes to which he has committed. By his own words, he expects to receive a sentence somewhere around 22 years in prison. I pointed out to him that given a dispute that may -- a dispute on how the sentencing guidelines calculation will work in his case, he could, in fact, be facing a life sentence. He agreed that that was absolutely correct, and that was absolutely a possibility.

So, I ask that you consider very carefully Mr. Friel's motives in testifying in this case. Remember, the jail sentence that he is facing for the crimes to which he has committed, remember that he is an admitted liar, and remember that in less than two weeks, he will be in this court room standing before Judge Bartle for sentencing. He is a highly motivated individual. He is highly motivated to cooperate. He acknowledged he's highly motivated so that the

## Defendant - Closing Argument

Government, he's hoping, will file what is known as a 5K motion at his sentencing, and he will receive a lesser sentence. That is what motivates him. So, I ask you to keep all of that in mind when considering his testimony in this case.

And, it will be up to you, members of the jury, to decide whether you determine that Mr. Friel was, in fact, a credible witness, considering everything that you've heard about him. I submit to you that he is a liar and that he's not a credible witness. But, ultimately that is your decision, and I ask that you keep in mind all of the facts and circumstances surrounding Mr. Friel's testimony when you consider his testimony during your deliberations.

Next, I'd like to talk about the testimony that you heard from FBI Special Agent Matthew Deragon. Agent Deragon is from New York. He testified earlier this week in this court room about what he did on the day of July 18, 2018. You will recall that that was the day that a team of eight armed FBI agents and one New York City police detective went to the El-Battouty residence in Queens, New York, executed a search warrant, they interviewed Mr. El-Battouty. You heard a lot about that, and I'll get to that in a moment. Remember also, though, that we talked -- I talked about with Agent Deragon during his testimony the status of the FBI's investigation in this case before he and his team of agents

## Defendant - Closing Argument

even knocked on the front door of the El-Battouty residence. You will recall that this investigation started way back in May of 2017, when an FBI undercover agent clicked on a link that he found while browsing the internet, and that took him into the Cam Girls server on Discord. That same FBI undercover agent engaged in monitoring of activity going on at Discord for several months that followed, and he recorded some of that activity. He specifically recorded activity that was taking place on Discord during that period of time that he was monitoring activity, activity that was being undertaken by the user who is known as Fritos. The FBI issued a search warrant for user information to Discord in July of 2017, and eventually there were a total of three search warrants that were issued to Discord for user information.

You will recall testimony that Discord provided user information in response to the search warrants, which included IP addresses. The FBI sent subpoenas to various internet service providers to find out the subscriber information that corresponded to those IP addresses, including an IP address that Verizon provided information to indicate that that IP address was associated with a residence in Woodside, New York, which was, in fact, the El-Battouty residence.

The FBI also did what was called open source

## Defendant - Closing Argument

Deragon about that. And the FBI learned that there were three individuals who lived at the El-Battouty residence in Woodside, New York -- the Defendant and his two parents. His 79-year-old father, and his mother, whose name is Anne. And lastly, you will recall that Agent Deragon testified about, about a lead that he received from the FBI in Philadelphia, that it asked the New York Division of the FBI to carry out this investigation search warrant, and Agent Deragon testified that he understood that it was the intention of the FBI to arrest individuals on July 18, 2018, the day that that search warrant was executed at the El-Battouty residence.

This is all the information that Agent Deragon and his team of agents had in their heads before they even knocked on the door of the El-Battouty residence. This investigation had proceeded very far. Significant amounts of information had been gathered, collected by the FBI, and Agent Deragon knew all that information before he even stepped up the stairs and knocked on the door of the El-Battouty residence.

The FBI arrived at the El-Battouty residence on July 18th at 6:01 in the morning. Within six minutes of their arrival at the residence, Agent Deragon and his partner proceeded in the parents' bedroom, across from Mr. El-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Defendant - Closing Argument

Battouty, the Defendant, in this case, interrogating him. It took them six minutes to start interrogating Mr. El-Battouty. They knew exactly who they were going to talk to when they got to that residence. They knew that it wasn't the 79-year-old father. They knew that it wasn't the Defendant's mother. They were targeting Mr. El-Battouty, the Defendant in this case, and it's clear from the timeline that they went right to him. It took them six minutes to focus their attention on Mr. El-Battouty.

Now, in the course of interrogating him, it's clear -- I believe it's clear. I submit to you that the agents misled Mr. El-Battouty about the investigation. You will recall from the audio recording of the interview that was played in Court that Mr. El-Battouty asked the agents a number of questions about the investigation and about his status. One minute into the interview, Agent Deragon says to Mr. El-Battouty, "I just want you to know right now that you're not under arrest, okay? Right now you're not in any trouble." It's clear, however, from the evidence, that that was not a true statement. Mr. El-Battouty was in serious trouble, and he was misled by Agent Deragon, who said to him you're not in any trouble. Twelve minutes into the interview, Mr. El-Battouty says "am I gonna go to jail or something?" Response from Agent Deragon, "well, I don't know that yet, man." Twenty-five minutes into the interview, Mr.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

El-Battouty says am I in trouble? Just tell me like what's going on. Answer from Agent Deragon, I don't know. These agents were clearly encouraging Mr. El-Battouty to talk, to answer their questions, and they were misleading him about how serious -- about, about how much trouble he really was in.

The other thing that's abundantly clear from the FBI's interrogation of Mr. El-Battouty is that the agents failed to adequately advise him of his rights. Recall what I just said a moment ago about Mr. Friel, and recall his testimony. The FBI agents who went to visit Mr. Friel, including Agent Johns, said it was FBI policy to advise someone in Mr. Friel's position of their rights before the interview started, and he was, in fact, advised of all of his That did not happen when Agent Deragon and his team of agents went to the El-Battouty residence and started their interrogations of Mr. El-Battouty. He was told some of his rights, but he certainly wasn't advised that he had the right to consult with a lawyer or he had the right to have a lawyer present while he was answering questions, or that he could stop the questions at any time, if he so chose, chose to do So, it's clear that the FBI policy that Mr. Friel spoke about that was applied to him in his case by Agent Johns evidently didn't apply to Mr. El-Battouty was he was interrogated by agents at his home.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Defendant - Closing Argument

Now, you heard evidence that Agent Deragon completed his interview of Mr. El-Battouty at 7:25 a.m., less than 90 minutes after the agents came into that house, and less than 90 minutes after Agent Deragon had told Mr. El-Battouty that he wasn't in trouble. He was in trouble. He was in serious trouble and, at the conclusion of that interview, at 7:25 a.m., Agent Deragon advised Mr. El-Battouty that he was going to be placed under arrest.

Now, Judge Bartle, in a few moments, will give you specific instructions on the law and its -- and specifically how much weight you may choose to give to Mr. El-Battouty's statement to the FBI. One factor that Judge Bartle will instruct you on and one factor that the Court will instruct you to consider, is whether you think that Mr. El-Battouty's statement to the FBI agents that day was voluntary. Court will instruct you that if you determine that Mr. El-Battouty's statement to the FBI was not voluntary, you may -you may, and indeed must, disregard it. Based upon the evidence that was presented at trial, I submit to you that you should conclude that Mr. El-Battouty's statement to the FBI that day was not voluntary, because Special Agent Deragon gave false assurances not once, not twice, but multiple times to Mr. El-Battouty about how much trouble he really was in. It's clear that Mr. El-Battouty, as I said, was in a great deal of trouble that day, even before that team of eight FBI

agents and one New York City police detective descended upon his family home in Queens, New York. Mr. El-Battouty's statement, under these circumstances, I submit to you, was not voluntary, and you should disregard it.

Now I'd like to turn to you -- talk to you about the specific charges in the case. You heard from the Government during their closing that count one, in this case, charges Mr. El-Baddouty -- El-Battouty with engaging in what the law calls a child exploitation enterprise, and Judge Bartle will give you specific instructions on what the law requires in that regard. And the Government attorney, during her closing argument, went through the elements. And I won't repeat those elements, other than to say I want to focus on the third element, which I believe is the most important element for the purposes of this case.

The third element is that -- requires the Government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant committed the offenses, the multiple offenses, in concert with three or more other persons. While we believe -- excuse me, while I submit to you that the Government has failed to meet its burden of proof on the first two elements, I really want to focus on the third. Now, you heard during the Government's closing that it's the Government's position that Mr. El-Battouty was part of an enterprise that consisted of numerous individuals located throughout the United States,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defendant - Closing Argument

and perhaps even in the world, all acting together, acting in concert, which is the legal term, by using the various Discord servers and text channels.

Once you receive instructions from the Court, in a few minutes, it will be your job to determine whether the Government has, in fact, proven beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. El-Battouty committed these offenses in concert with three or more other persons. You will have to decide whether Mr. El-Battouty and the other alleged members of what the Government refers to as this enterprise, were essentially in business or partnership together in order to do these illegal things. And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, that the evidence in this case falls far short of establishing that Mr. El-Battouty act, acted in concert with anyone, let alone three or more other persons.

I ask that you consider the following evidence that was presented at the trial in this case. The evidence is clear that Mr. El-Battouty never met with any of the other individuals who were alleged to have been users on these various Discord servers. It's undisputed that the Discord users that -- who, who have been referred to during this trial, didn't know each other's real names. They only know -- knew each other by their online user names. Mr. El-Battouty never knew where any of these individuals

lived, or even what they looked like. They may have lived

# Defendant - Closing Argument

down the street from him, they may have lived across the country, they may have lived in another part of the world. He did not know. There's no evidence that's been presented that Mr. El-Battouty spoke to any of them on the phone, and certainly never met any of them face-to-face. Everything that Mr. El-Battouty has alleged to have done in this case occurred while he was sitting behind the computer screen in his parents' home in Queens, New York.

Now, during the course of the trial, you heard testimony about how the Discord servers and the various subrooms in each of those servers operate, and you heard evidence about how users can post messages on those servers and can communicate with one another. But the Government failed to introduce any evidence demonstrating that Discord users on these particular services — servers, excuse me, coordinated their online activities or their messages.

Instead, users could log in at any time, and they could read messages at any time, and they could post messages at any time. Users could choose not to log on to Discord. It was entirely up to them. Users could participate in any number of servers or channels at any one time, or not.

The Government did not present any credible evidence suggesting that the Discord -- that Discord users had a common purpose or a common goal, nor did the text channel messages that were introduced into evidence by the Government

contain any such discussion over a common purpose or a common goal nor, I submit to you, can any common purpose be reasonably inferred from the activities of Discord users on these various servers.

Now you heard throughout the course of the trial and, and, again, this morning in the Government's closing, that the user known as Fritos had some sort of a leadership rule, leadership role, with the Discord servers that are at issue in this case. It is undisputed, however, in this case, that Fritos did not create the Cam Girl server. He did not create the Thot Counselors server. He did not create any of the sub-channels or sub-rooms contained with any -- within either one of those servers.

And while the Government argues to you that Fritos was apparently designated this Senior Counsel role on Thot Counselors, I submit to you that there was no credible evidence presented that Fritos exercised any actual leadership or administrative role with in the Discord servers. There was no evidence that Fritos wrote the rules or the guidelines that governed how these servers were to operate. There's no evidence that Fritos established the naming conventions that the Government spoke about in, in their, in their closing argument a few moments ago, the naming convention for certain files.

I ask that you remember that the Government has to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. El-Battouty committed the offenses in question in concert with three or more other persons, and this is critically important. only live witness who testified at trial who could possibly considered one of these three or more other persons was Mr. Friel. I've already addressed the serious credibility problems that it -- that, that Mr. Friel has, and I'm not going to repeat that again. You've already heard that. I've already talked about Mr. Friel's deep-seated motivation in this case to cooperate with the Government against Mr. El-Battouty in order to curry favor with the prosecution and to earn what he is hoping to be -- what he is hoping will be a lesser sentence when he is sentenced in two weeks. So, I respectfully suggest that you disregard Mr. Friel's testimony, and he cannot be considered one of the three or more other individuals for purposes of the in concert requirement for this element of count one.

So, if we take Mr. Friel out of the equation, the Government cannot establish the existence of three or more other persons without utilizing the messages that were posted on the various message boards on the Discord servers, which we saw at trial. But it's equally clear that each individual on -- each individual user on Discord posted messages whenever that user saw fit to do so at a time and in a manner of his own choosing.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Government pointed out that Discord's users would sometimes ask questions of other users or would respond with gratitude to a previous post. But I submit to you that answering a question post -- posted on a message board or saying thank you in response to a posting on a message board, is not the same as acting in concert.

Agent Johns testified twice in this case, you will During his second testimony, he testified extensively about forensic analysis that was performed by the FBI on the various computer devices that were seized from the El-Battouty residence -- the desktop computer, the external hard drive. Agent Johns testified that many of the items that were found on the external hard drive represented what he agreed with me could be characterized fairly as one-on-one interactions. In other words, he discovered numerous screenshots of Snapchat and other types of text message exchanges, and Agent Johns acknowledged that these interactions took place outside of Discord, entirely separate from the Discord activity that we've been talking about so much in this case.

So, I submit to you that you should not consider any of these one-on-one interactions, the evidence of which Agent Johns testified was found on the external hard drive, for purposes of determining whether Mr. El-Battouty is guilty on count one, because by their very nature, these one-on-one

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interactions could not possibly be considered to be offenses committed in concert with three or more other persons for purposes of count one.

The second crime that Mr. El-Battouty is charge with in this case, as you know, is conspiracy to advertise child pornography. And again, you will hear from Judge Bartle in a few moments about the law as it applies to that particular crime. You will learn that a conspiracy is when two or more individuals get together and agree to work together to carry out the object of the conspiracy. So, to have a conspiracy you have to have two or more individuals, and you need, most importantly, an agreement to carry out the object of the conspiracy, to work together toward a common purpose. And it's equally clear, as you will hear from the Court, that the Government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the participants in the conspiracy knowingly and intentionally agreed to work together toward that common purpose. So, to prove a conspiracy in this case against Mr. El-Battouty, the Government will have to show beyond a reasonable doubt that he knowingly and intentionally agreed to work together with all of these other individuals to achieve a common goal, and that is to advertise child pornography.

So, let's start with the requirement that the Government prove the existence of an agreement among co-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Defendant - Closing Argument

conspirators. So, what is the evidence of an agreement in this case? I submit to you that there is no evidence of an agreement in this case. Again, the only potential coconspirator that you heard from, who testified live in this court room, was Mr. Friel. No other potential coconspirators testified live, so Mr. Friel is the only one who came into this court room and testified. I will not repeat what I've already said about Mr. Friel, other than to say his testimony, I submit, should not be considered for purposes of your deliberations into whether there was an agreement. So, setting aside Mr. Friel's testimony, the only other way that the Government can prove an agreement in this case is by relying upon the Discord messages. But again, I submit to you that those messages contain no evidence of an agreement whatsoever, and certainly not proof of an agreement beyond a reasonable doubt.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, at the end of the trial, you heard testimony regarding four young women whose videos were posted to one of the Discord servers. In considering the evidence and the testimony regarding those four individuals, I'd just ask that you keep in mind a few points. The user who went by the name Fritos did not post the links to those videos that were uploaded to Discord. Agent Johns agreed with me in his testimony that Fritos was not the user that uploaded those links to Discord. This was

done by other users on the Discord servers. The Government didn't present any, any evidence that the user Fritos was responsible for recording the videos of those four young women. And lastly, the Government presented no evidence that the user Fritos had any type of one-on-one interaction with any of those four young women.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in conclusion, this case is ultimately about a single person who was glued to his computer day and night, engaging in one-on-one action — interactions using applications such as Snapchat and other types of text messaging, and who read and posted messages on a Discord server or servers. You may ultimately decide that this individual engaged in disgusting and abhorrent behavior. But he did so alone, and he did so for his own purposes and not in concert with, or in any type of a conspiratorial agreement with others.

So, inclusion -- in conclusion, I once again I thank you for your service, and I ask that you return a verdict of not guilty on both counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, as I told you yesterday, the Government under our rules, is entitled to a short rebuttal. Ms. Shoop?

MS. SHOOP: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SHOOP: Pedos and pervs. Pedophiles and perverts. That's what the Defendant and his buddies on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Discord call themselves. You saw that in the messages. The user DarkU, he was right when he said youngees (ph) are so easy. Children are easy targets, they're very easy targets. All day, all night, for approximately two years, the Defendant and the other users on Discord, they worked together and they targeted thousands of children. about that number. Let there be no mistake, ladies and gentlemen, the Defendant sitting in front of you is absolutely guilty of engaging in a child exploitation enterprise. He's absolutely guilty of engaging in a conspiracy to advertise child pornography. It doesn't matter that none of these people met in person. The Judge will tell you actually, the law specifically states that the Government does not have to prove that the members of the conspiracy directly met, that they even know each other in real life, or that all the members of the conspiracy are even known.

Let's talk about the agreement that the Defense

Counsel talked about. It doesn't matter that there's not a

formal written agreement between the members on Discord.

That's what the law says. It specifically states that the

Government does not have to prove the existence of a formal

or written agreement, or even an oral one. And think about

that for a moment. That makes sense, right? We don't have

criminals coming together at a table, sitting down, signing a

contract like they're buying a car. That's not how these

operations work. That's not how this group of people worked. The law also does not require that the Defendant played a substantial role in the conspiracy. That's what it says. That's what the Judge will instruct you. But in this case, he did. He was Senior Counsel. He was the Epics. He himself did, in fact, have the power to kick people out, and he admits that in his interview.

The law states that you may find the existence of a conspiracy based on the circumstances surrounding the scheme. That word scheme, that's literally in the law. The Judge will instruct you about that. That's what a conspiracy is, it's a scheme, a scheme where people participate together. And the circumstances surrounding the scheme in this case are very clear. The Defendant and the other members on Cam Girls and Thot Counselors, they were a team. Think about the way they operated. They moved from server to server together. They did congratulate one another. They encouraged each other. They shared different techniques and methods about obtaining the required content. They created rules, they had a hierarchy. Only certain members had access to certain stuff. They shared the file with the child pornography, they shared the links to child pornography. They were organized.

I want to talk to you about this one-on-one that the Defense Counsel mentioned. Did Mr. El-Battouty really work alone? Come on, really? You've watched the undercover

recordings. You've read the chats. You've heard his own statement. He didn't work alone, he worked with all of these other users. In fact, he literally gives a list in his interview. Oh, I know fap89, I known Harmon, I know DarkU, I know Toot, I know Jizzbomb, I know Orlok, I know Davis (ph), I know Lightsmare (ph), I know Opensbobsburger (ph), I know The Goat. He literally highlighted all of those users in his interview, that he knew, that he worked with. There was nothing about this that was one-on-one on Discord. They all worked together.

Now, what I will say is yeah, you know what the oneon-one was, is when he went out and he talked to these kids
on his own to produce the child pornography, to do what with
it? Bring it back to the group. That's how they operated.
You can literally see that from the gifs that the Government
has presented to you. The full files of those videos that he
produced one-on-one, those are on his computer. They're on
that hard drive. He did use specialized software to cut a
three-second clip, and then upload it to the group. So, you
know what? The Government will agree, he did engage in oneon-one communications with a minor, but for the benefit and
the common goal of the group.

Let's talk about Timothy Friel for a second. The Defense is right. He sat up there and he told you he has pled guilty. He's pled guilty to engaging in a child

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Government - Rebuttal Argument

exploitation enterprise on Discord. Everything that he testified up there about was corroborated by the evidence -how they operated, how they worked, the purpose. That's the same thing that Agent Johns saw when he was a member of it. Was he lying about being JJchuck, the user? Well no, because we saw the undercover recordings. He's like yeah, that's me. Was he lying about the way they operated? You saw that. You saw it in the chats. You saw it in the undercover recordings. You heard it from Agent Johns. Is it surprising that when the FBI showed up to his house, that he lied and said I haven't seen child pornography? Is it surprising that he didn't want to admit to being in this organized scheme, this child exploitation enterprise? That's not surprising. Everything that he testified to on that stand has been corroborated by other evidence, and you get to consider that when considering his credibility.

I'm going to also comment about Agent Deragon.
You've heard the interview yourself. The Defense used this word, interrogation. Did that sound like an interrogation?
Was Agent Deragon yelling at the Defendant? Did that sound forceful? Did he seem coercive? His tone was completely conversational. They had the chat in his parents' bedroom, where they had the door open just so that he would feel more comfortable. And, in fact, if you go back and listen to that interview, the Defendant says, when they talk about the

digital devices, I can show you. He volunteers to walk over with the FBI agent to the digital devices to show him all the child pornography. There was nothing coercive about that.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to leave you with this.

Government Exhibit 19A, that's this right here, this little tiny hard drive. This tiny little device contains thousands of children that were manipulated by the Defendant to get naked on a web camera, to stick foreign objects in their bodies, for what? For his sexual gratification. There are so many files, which you saw when Agent Johns was testifying, on that hard drive, it's almost hard to actually comprehend how this man and his co-conspirators even engaged with that many real children over two years. But he did. But they did.

THE COURT: Two more minutes, Ms. Shoop.

MS. SHOOP: Thank you, Your Honor. As Ms. Britsch told you, the children in this case are real. You saw a mome testify on the stand yesterday. She has a real daughter. They have homes. They go to school. They have moms and dads. They're real. As you deliberate in this case, as you go back and you talk about the evidence and you review the evidence, think about the victims. The Defendant in this case, he's guilty. He was a member of the group, he was an active participant, and we ask that you find him guilty of a child exploitation enterprise and for being part of these

groups that advertise child pornography.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Members of the jury, we will now take our morning recess of 15 minutes. The case has not yet been submitted for deliberation. Please do not discuss it at the recess. When we return, I will give you your instructions.

COURTY REPORTER/ESP JIMMY CRUZ: All rise.

(Recess 10:53 a.m., until 11:42 a.m.)

MS. MAKELY: All rise. Court is now in session.

THE COURT: You may be seated. I want to apologize to you, members of the jury. I had an emergency matter that I had to deal with, so that's why there was a delay. Thank you for your patience. Members of the jury, we have now arrived at the point in the case where I charge you before you go out to deliberate. That is to say, this is the point when I tell you what the law is. You must apply that law to the facts that you find from the evidence before you. You are not single out any one instruction of mine as stating the law. Rather, you should consider as a whole all the instructions that I give you. On the other hand, as I have told you, the determination of the facts, the determination of questions of fact, and the rendering of a verdict, are all matters solely within your province. Therefore, I want to emphasize what I said at the outset. Nothing I have said or done during the course of this trial or will say during the course of this charge was meant by me or should be taken by

you as some sort of a hint from me as to what your verdict should be. The verdict is your function alone, and not mine. It is your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence in the case without prejudice again or sympathy for either the Government or the Defendant. Both parties accept -- expect that you will carefully and impartially consider all the evidence in the case, follow the law as stated by The Court, and reach a just verdict, regardless of the consequences. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors in this case. They have the right, as do I, to expect nothing less from you.

You will recall that I earlier told you that what a lawyer says to you is not evidence. The only exception to this rule are stipulations or agreements of the parties. The parties may agree to stipulate to one or more facts, in which case you may accept the fact or facts as evidence. You are not required to do so, however, since you are the sole judges of the facts. The lawyers' opening speeches to you, the questions that they asked during the trial, their objections, their arguments and comments to me, and last of all, what they have just said to you in their closing summations, none of that is evidence. The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant and most helpful to the lawyers' client and, in so doing, to call your

attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your notice. However, it is your recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls in the case. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you. Further, any questions that I may have asked are not evidence which you may consider. Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence, neither is the superseding indictment evidence. It is merely an accusation or charge, and it is not proof of anything or evidence of any kind against the Defendant.

The evidence you are to consider in rendering the verdict in this case is the testimony of witnesses regardless of who may have called them, and the documents or other exhibits that have been admitted into evidence, regardless of who may have produced them. The Government and the Defendant have agreed to certain stipulated facts. You may therefore treat these facts as having been proven. You are not required to do so, however, since you are the sole judges of the facts.

I have taken what is called judicial notice of the fact that Bucks County is in this judicial district -- that is, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. You may accept this fact as proven, but you are not required to do so. As with any fact, the final decision of whether to accept it is for you to make, and you are not required to agree with me.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In reviewing the evidence, it should not be considered by you in fragmentary parts as though each fact or circumstance stood apart from the others. You should consider the entire evidence and determine its weight from the whole body of that evidence. If evidence came in and objection was sustained, or if I instructed you to disregard it, you must put it out of your mind as if you had never heard it. You are absolutely bound to do that.

The Defendant, Sharif El-Battouty, pleaded not quilty to the offenses charged. He is presumed to be innocent. The Defendant starts the trial with a clean slate, with no evidence against him. The presumption of innocence stays with the Defendant unless and until the Government has presented evidence that overcomes that presumption by convincing you that the Defendant is guilty of the offenses charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The presumption of innocence requires that you find the Defendant Not Guilty on a charge unless you are satisfied that the Government has proven guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on that charge. The presumption of innocence means that the Defendant has no burden or obligation to present any evidence at all or to prove that he is not guilty. The burden or obligation of proof is on the Government to prove that the Defendant is guilty, and this burden stays with the Government throughout The burden is always upon the Government to prove the trial.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

quilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The law does not impose any burden on a Defendant and does not require a Defendant to prove his or her innocence or to produce any evidence at all. The Government has the heavy burden of proving a Defendant quilty beyond a reasonable doubt and, if it fails to do so, you must acquit the Defendant. The Government must establish each of the elements of the offense with which a Defendant is charged by proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Thus, for example, if a crime has three elements and the Government proves only two of them beyond a reasonable doubt, you must acquit on that charge. Similarly, some elements of the charged offenses may be proved in one or more different ways. Under that circumstance, you may not convict the Defendant unless you unanimously agree that the Government has met its burden of proof on at least one of the alternatives or options.

The requirement that the Government prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt, however, does not mean that it must prove guilt beyond all possible doubt. The test is one of reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense. After careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case, the kind of doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

upon it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs. Reasonable doubt is doubt which appeals to your reason, to your judgment, to your common sense, and to your experience. It is not caprice or whim or speculation. It is not an excuse to avoid the performance of an unpleasant duty. A Defendant may not be convinced (sic) based on suspicion or conjecture, but only on evidence proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

As I discussed with you earlier, there are two types of evidence which you may properly consider. One is what we call direct evidence. This is testimony by an eyewitness, someone who saw or heard something. Thus, as I explained earlier, if someone looked outside and saw that it was snowing, that person could testify that she saw it snowing at a particular time and place, and her testimony would be direct evidence of the fact that it had snowed. The other type of evidence is called circumstantial evidence. That is, proof of a chain of circumstances pointing to a conclusion about another fact. Thus, if the same person went to sleep at night and there was no snow on the ground, but when she awoke the ground was covered with fresh snow, she could testify to those circumstances, and you could infer from this circumstantial evidence the fact that it had snowed during the night, even though she never saw a flake of snow fall. As a general rule, the law makes no distinction between

direct and circumstantial evidence. It simply requires that before convicting a Defendant on any count, you, the jury, must be satisfied of the Defendant's guilt on that count beyond a reasonable doubt from all the evidence, whether direct or circumstantial.

In reaching your verdict, you are expected to use your good sense and consider the evidence for only those purposes for which it has been admitted. Further, you are expected to give the evidence reasonable and fair construction in light of your common knowledge of the natural tendencies and inclinations of human beings. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which you conclude have been established by the evidence.

In your consideration of the evidence, you are not limited to the bald statements of the witnesses. You are permitted to draw inferences, but only from facts which you have found to be proven from the evidence, and only such inferences as seem justified in light of your experience. The inferences that you can draw, however, are only inferences reasonably and fairly based upon the evidence. In rendering a verdict, you must consider the credibility of witnesses. Credibility is just another word for believability, and you, the jurors, are the sole judges of the believability of all the witnesses, as well as the sole

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

judges of the weight their testimony deserves. You should carefully scrutinize all the testimony each witness has given and every matter of evidence which tends to show whether a witness is worthy of belief. You should decide whether you believe what each witness had to say, and how important that testimony was. In making your assessment, you should carefully scrutinize all the testimony given, the circumstances under which each witness has testified, and every matter in evidence which tends to show whether a witness, in your determination, is worthy of belief. Consider each witness's intelligence, motive to falsify, and state of mind. Consider his or her demeanor while on the stand. Ask yourself a few questions. Did the person impress you as honest? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness have any relationship with either the Government or the Defense? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness have the ability to observe the matters as to which he or she has testified? Did the witness have the opportunity and ability to understand the questions and clearly, clearly, and answer them directly? Did the witness's testimony differ from the testimony of other witnesses? Did the witness demonstrate any bias, prejudice, or hostility? These are a few of the considerations that will help you determine the

accuracy of what each witness said. After making your assessment concerning the credibility of a witness, you may decide to believe all of that witness's testimony, only a portion of it, or none of it.

Members of the jury, you are not required to accept testimony even though the testimony is uncontradicted and the witness is not impeached. You may decide, because of the witness's bearing and demeanor, or because of the inherent improbability of his or her testimony, or any part thereof, or for other reasons sufficient to you, that such testimony is not worthy of belief in whole or in part. And should you find that any witness has testified falsely, then you may either disregard entirely the testimony of that witness, or accept some part of it and reject the other part of it, whether or not it is contradicted.

In this case, you have heard as witnesses certain persons who are law enforcement officers; in this case, agents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation I instruct you that these persons are here only as witnesses. You should judge their credibility as you would any other witness. You should not give their testimony any great, greater, or lesser weight, or judge them more or less credible just because they are employees or officers of the Government. At the same time, it is quite legitimate for Defense Counsel to try to attack the believability of a law

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enforcement officer on the ground that his or her testimony may be colored by a personal or professional interest in the outcome of the case. You must decide, after reviewing the evidence, whether you believe the testimony of the law enforcement witnesses, and how much weight, if any, it deserves.

You have heard evidence that Timothy Friel entered into a Plea Agreement with the Government. His testimony was received into evidence, and may be considered by you. you should consider his testimony with great care and caution. In evaluating his testimony, you should consider this factor, along with the others I have called to your attention. Whether or not his testimony may have been influenced by the Plea Agreement is for you to determine. You may give his testimony such weight as you think it deserves. You must not consider his guilty plea as any evidence of Defendant's guilt. Mr. Friel's decision to plead quilty was a personal decision about his own guilt. evidence is offered only to allow you to assess the credibility of the witness, to eliminate any concern that the Defendant has been singled out for prosecution, and to explain how the witness came to possess detailed firsthand knowledge of the events about which he has testified. You may consider his guilty plea only for these purposes. You have also heard that before the trial, one witness made

statements that may be different from his testimony in this trial. It is for you to determine whether these statements were made, and whether they were different from the witness's testimony in this trial. These earlier statements were brought to your attention only to help you decide whether to believe the witness's testimony here at trial. You cannot use the earlier statements as proof of the truth of what the witness said in those earlier statements that was not made under oath. You can only use them as one way of evaluating the witness's testimony in this trial.

The Defendant did not testify in this case. A witness -- rather, a Defendant has an absolute constitutional right not to testify. The burden of proof remains with the Government throughout the entire trial, and never shifts to the Defendant. A Defendant is never required to prove that he is innocent. You must not attach any significance to the fact that the Defendant did not testify. You must not draw any adverse inference against him because he did not take the witness stand. Do not consider, for any reason at all, the fact that the Defendant did not testify. Do not discuss that fact during your deliberations or let it influence your decision in any way.

The Government introduced evidence that the Defendant made a statement to law enforcement. You must decide whether the Defendant did, in fact, make the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

statement. If you find that the Defendant did make the statement, then you must decide what weight, if any, you feel the statement deserves. In making that decision, you should consider all matters into evidence having to do with the statement, including those concerning the Defendant himself and the circumstances under which the statement was made. If, after considering the evidence you determine that a statement was made voluntarily, you may give it such weight as you feel it deserves under the circumstances. On the other hand, if you determine that the statement was not made voluntarily, you must disregard it. In determining whether any alleged statement was made voluntarily, you should consider the Defendant's age, training, education, occupation, and physical and mental condition, and his treatment while in custody or under interrogation, as shown by the evidence in the case. Also consider all the other circumstances into evidence surrounding the making of the alleged statement.

Although the Government is required to prove that
the Defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the
Government is not required to call all witnesses as witnesses
all persons who may have been present at any time or place
involved in the case, or who may appear to have some
knowledge of the matters in issue at this trial.
Furthermore, the Government is not required to present all

possible evidence related to the case.

The punishment provided by law for the offenses charged in the superseding indictment is a matter exclusively within the province of The Court should there be a verdict of guilty on any count. Punishment should never be considered by you, the jury, in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict as to the offenses charged. You will note that the superseding indictment charges that the offenses were committed on or about certain dates or in and about certain periods of time. The Government does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of the alleged offenses. It is sufficient if the Government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the dates alleged.

The superseding indictment alleges that some act in furtherance of the offenses charged occurred in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. There is no requirement that all aspects of each offense charged take place here, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The Government also does not need to prove that the Defendant himself personally committed any acts within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. But for you to return a guilty verdict on a crime charged in the superseding indictment, the Government must prove that some act in furtherance of that crime committed by any participant in the offense, whether or not

that participant was the Defendant, took place here, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The Government must prove all the elements of each of the two crimes charged beyond a reasonable doubt, but unlike all the elements of the crimes charged, the fact that some act in furtherance of a crime charged took place in this judicial district only has to be proven by a preponderance of the evidence. This means the Government only has to prove that its existence is more likely than not.

The Defendant is charged with two offenses. Each offense is charged in a separate count of the superseding indictment. The number of offenses charged is not evidence of guilt, and this should not influence your decision in any way. You must separately consider the evidence against the Defendant on each offense charged, and you must return a separate verdict on each offense. For each offense charged, you must decide whether the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of that particular offense. Your decision on one offense, whether guilty or not guilty, should not influence your decision on the other offense.

Before the Defendant may be found guilty of either crime charged in the superseding indictment, the Government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt that he acted in a manner forbidden by the law as charged in the superseding

indictment, and that he acted with the requisite state of mind.

I will now explain to you the offenses with which the Defendant is charged and the law which you must apply in this case. You are to determine whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty only as to the specific charges brought against him by the Government. Such charges are the only charges before you to consider. The Defendant is not on trial for any conduct which is not charged as a crime in the superseding indictment.

As I explained at the beginning of the trial, a superseding indictment is just a formal way of specifying the exact crime the Defendant is accused of committing. A superseding indictment is simply the description of the charges against the Defendant. It is an accusation only. It is not evidence of anything and should not be given any weight -- and you should not give any weight to the fact that the Defendant has been indicted in making your decision in this case.

The superseding indictment charges the Defendant with two crimes. One, engaging in a child exploitation enterprise; and two, conspiracy to advertise child pornography. The offenses charged in the superseding indictment require proof of the Defendant's state of mind at the time of the commission of the alleged offense. That is,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Government must prove that the Defendant intended to commit each of the offenses in issue. Often the state of mind with which a Defendant acts at any given time cannot be proven directly because one cannot read another person's mind and tell what that person is thinking. However, the Defendant's state of mind can be proven indirectly from the surrounding circumstances. Thus, to determine the Defendant's state of mind at a particular time, you may consider evidence about what he said, what he did or failed to do, how he acted, and all the other facts and circumstances shown by the evidence that may prove what was in the Defendant's mind at that time. It is entirely up to you to decide what the evidence presented during this trial proves or fails to prove about the Defendant's state of mind. You may also consider the natural and probable results or consequences of any acts the Defendant knowingly did and whether it is reasonable to conclude that he intended those results or consequences. You may find, but you are not required to find, that the Defendant knew and intended the natural and probable consequences or results of the acts he knowingly did. This means that if you find that an ordinary person in the Defendant's situation would have naturally realized that certain consequences would result from his actions, then you may find, but you are not required to find, that the Defendant did know and did intend those consequences

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would result from his actions. This is entirely up to you to decide as the finders of facts in this case. The offenses charged in the superseding indictment require the Government to prove that the Defendant acted knowingly with respect to certain elements of the offenses. This means that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant was conscious and aware of the nature of his actions and of the surrounding facts and circumstances as specified in the definitions of the offenses charged. In deciding whether the Defendant acted knowingly, you may consider in evidence about what the Defendant said, what the Defendant did and failed to do, how the Defendant acted, and all the other facts and circumstances shown by the evidence that may prove what was in Defendant's mind at the time. Government, however, is not required to prove that the Defendant knew his acts were against the law. In contrast, motive is not an element of the offense with which the Defendant is charged. Proof of bad motive is not required to convict. Further, proof of bad motive alone does not establish that the Defendant is guilty, and proof of good motive alone does not establish that the Defendant is not Evidence of the Defendant's motive, however, may help you find the Defendant's intent. Intent and motive are different concepts. Motive is what prompts a person to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the

particular act is done. Personal advancement and financial gain, for example, are motives for much of human conduct. However, these motives may prompt one person intentionally to do something perfectly acceptable, while prompting another person intentionally to do an act that is a crime.

I now instruct you on the specific elements that the Government must prove for the offense charged in count one of the superseding indictment. This count charges that from in or about July 2016 through on or before August 29, 2018, the Defendant knowingly engaged in a child exploitation enterprise. In order for you to find the Defendant guilty of engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, you must find that the Government has proven each of the following three elements. One, that the Defendant committed a series of felony violations constituting three or more separate incidents. Two, that the three or more incidents together involved more than one victim in total. And three, that the Defendant committed these offenses in concert with three or more other persons.

I will explain the first element in more detail. I will also further define the alleged felony violations which the Government must prove in order to establish the existence of child -- a child exploitation enterprise and the Defendant's participation in it. As I mentioned, the first element of the crime of engaging in a child exploitation

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enterprise is the Defendant's commission of a series of felony violations constituting three or more separate incidents. I will now define for you the various types of felony violations which are required to establish a child exploitation enterprise. The felony violations must be one or more of the following. Advertising child pornography is one of the relevant types of felony violations. The elements of that offense are one, that the Defendant knowingly made, printed, or published, or caused to be made, printed, or published, a notice or advertisement. Two, that the notice or advertisement sought or offered to receive, exchange, produce, display, distribute, or reproduce a visual Three, that the visual depiction involved the use depiction. of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct. Four, that the visual depiction was of such conduct. And five, that the Defendant knew or had reason to know that such notice or advertisement would be transported using a means or facility of interstate commerce, or in or affecting interstate commerce by any means, including by computer, or that such notice or advertisement was transported using any means or facility of interstate commerce, or in or affecting interstate commerce by any means, including by computer. Transporting child pornography is another relevant type of felony violation. The elements of that offense are one, that the Defendant knowingly transported or shipped a visual

depiction using any means or facility of interstate commerce, or in or affecting interstate commerce by any means, including by computer. Two, that the production of the visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct. Three, that the visual depiction was of such conduct. And four, that the Defendant knew that the production of the depiction involved the use of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct and that the depiction was of such conduct.

Distributing child pornography is the third relevant type of felony violation. The elements of that offense are one, that the Defendant knowingly distributed a visual depiction. Two, that the depiction was distributed using any means or facility of interstate commerce, or that the depiction had been shipped or transported in or affecting interstate commerce by any means, including by computer. Three, that the production of the visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct. Four, that the depiction is of the minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct. And five, that the Defendant knew that the production of the depiction involved the use of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct and that the depiction was of such conduct.

Receiving child pornography is a fourth relevant type of felony violation. The elements of that offense are

that the Defendant knowingly received a visual depiction; that the depiction was received using any means or facility of interstate commerce, or that the depiction had been shipped or transported in or affecting interstate commerce by any means, including by computer; that the production of the visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct; that the depiction is of the minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct; and that the Defendant knew that the production of the depiction involved the use of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct and that the depiction was of such conduct.

In order for you to find that the first element of count one has been satisfied, you must unanimously agree as to which felony violations, as described above, Defendant committed, and that the felony violations constituted three or more separate incidents. You must be unanimous as to the violations and the three or more incidents.

To find the Defendant guilty of engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, you must also find that the Defendant committed the three or more incidents of felony violations in concert with three or more other persons. It is not necessary that each individual incident was committed in concert with three or more other persons. The required total of three other persons may be tallied by considering all the incidents together.

I will now further define for you the terms minor, visual depiction, sexually explicit conduct, and facility of interstate commerce. As used in these instructions, minor means any person under the age of 18 years at the time of the offense. Visual depiction includes data stored on a computer disc or by electronic means which is capable of conversion into a visual image, and data which is capable of conversion into a visual image that has been transported — transmitted by any means, whether or not stored in a permanent format. Sexually explicit conduct means actual or simulated masturbation; lascivious exhibition of the genitals or pubic area of any person; sexual intercourse, including genital, oral genital, anal genital, or oral anal; bestiality, or sadistic or masochistic abuse.

The word lascivious means tend to excite lust, lewd, indecent, obscene, sexually -- sexual impurity, tending to deprive the morals and respect of sexual relations, licentious. In determining whether a depiction -- visual depiction is lascivious, you may consider the following factors: Where the focal point of the picture is the child's genitals or pubic area; where the setting is sexually suggestive as, for example, in a place or pose generally associated with sexual activity; where the child is depicted in an unnatural pose considering the age of the child; where the child is partially clothed or nude; where the picture

suggests sexual coyness or willingness to engage in sexual activity; where the picture is intended or designed to elicit a sexual response in a viewer; where the picture portrays the child as a sexual object; and the caption, if any, on the picture. Of course, a visual depiction need not involve all of these factors to be a lascivious exhibition. The weight or lack of weight which you give to any of these factors is for you to decide.

A facility of interstate commerce includes any thing, tool, or device that is involved in interstate commerce. The internet is a facility of interstate commerce, and the transmission of a visual depiction by means of the internet constitutes transportation of the visual depiction in interstate commerce. That is, movement between different states in the United States.

The Defendant is also charged, in count two of the superseding indictment, with conspiracy to advertise child pornography. It is a federal crime for two or more persons to agree or conspire to advertise child pornography, even if they never actually chieve — achieve their objective. A conspiracy is a kind of criminal partnership. In order for you to find the Defendant guilty of conspiracy to advertise child pornography, you must find that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that — each of the following three elements. One, that two or more persons

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agreed to advertise child pornography. Two, that the Defendant was a party to or member of that agreement. And three, that the Defendant joined the agreement or conspiracy knowing of its objective and intending to join with at least one other alleged conspirator to achieve that objective; that is, that the Defendant and at least one other alleged conspirator shared a unity of purpose and intent to achieve a common goal or objective to advertise child pornography. I will explain each of these elements in more detail. I've already explained to you the elements of the offense that is alleged to be the objective of the conspiracy; that is, the offense of advertisement of child pornography in paragraph -in an earlier paragraph. The first element of the crime of conspiracy is the existence of an agreement. The Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that two or more persons knowingly and intentionally arrived at a mutual understanding or agreement, either spoken or unspoken, to work together to achieve the overall objective of the conspiracy, to commit the offense of advertisement of child pornography. The Government does not have to prove the existence of a formal or written agreement, or an express oral agreement spelling out the details of the understanding. Government also does not have to prove that all members of the conspiracy directly met or discussed between themselves their unlawful objective, or agreed to all the details, or

agreed to what the means were by which the objective would be accomplished. The Government is not even required to prove that all the people named in the superseding indictment were, in fact, parties to the agreement, or that all members of the alleged conspiracy were named, or that all members of the conspiracy are even known. What the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that two or more persons, in some way or matter, arrived at some type of agreement, mutual understanding, or meeting of the minds, to try to accomplish a common and unlawful objective.

You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding whether the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that an agreement or mutual understanding existed. You may find the existence of a conspiracy based on reasonable inferences drawn from the actions and statements of the alleged members of the conspiracy, from the circumstances surrounding the scheme, and from evidence of related facts and circumstances which proved that the activities or the participants in a crime venture and could not have been carried out except as the result of a preconceived agreement, scheme, or understanding.

If you find that a criminal agreement or conspiracy existed, then in order to find the Defendant guilty of conspiracy, you must also find that the Government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant knowingly and intentionally joined

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that agreement or conspiracy during its existence. Government must prove that the Defendant knew the goal or objective of the agreement or conspiracy and voluntarily joined it during its existence intending to achieve the common goal or objective, to work together with the other alleged conspirators toward that goal or objective. Government need not prove that the Defendant knew everything about the conspiracy, or that he knew everyone involved in it, or that he was a member from the beginning. Government also does not have to prove that the Defendant played a major or substantial role in the conspiracy. You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding whether the Defendant joins the conspiracy, knew of its criminal objective, and intended to further the objective; evidence which shows that the Defendant only knew about the conspiracy or only kept bad company by associating with members of the conspiracy; or was only present when it was discussed or when a crime was committed. It is not sufficient to prove that the Defendant was a member of the conspiracy, even if the Defendant approved of what was happening or did not object to it. Likewise, evidence showing that the Defendant may have done something that happened to help a conspiracy does not necessarily prove that he joined the conspiracy. You may, however, consider this evidence with all the other evidence in deciding whether the

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant joined the conspiracy.

In order to find the Defendant guilty of conspiracy, you must find that the Government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant joined the conspiracy knowing of its objective and intending to help further or achieve that That is, the Government must prove one, that the objective. Defendant knew of the objective or goal of the conspiracy. Two, that the Defendant joined the conspiracy intending to help further achieve that goal or objective. And three, that the Defendant and at least one other alleged conspirator shared a unity of purpose toward that objective or goal. You may consider both direct evidence and circumstantial evidence, including the Defendant's word or conduct, and other facts and circumstances, in deciding whether the Defendant had the required knowledge and intent. example, evidence that the Defendant derived some benefit from the conspiracy or had some stake in the achievement of the conspiracy's objective might intend to show that the Defendant had the required intent or purpose that the conspiracy's objective be achieved.

Members of the jury, the Government is not required to prove that any of the members of the conspiracy were successful in achieving any or all of the objectives of the conspiracy. You may find the Defendant guilty of conspiracy

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if you find that the Government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the elements that I have explained, even if you find the Government did not prove that any of the conspiracy -conspirators actually committed the offense of advertising of child pornography. Conspiracy is a criminal offense separate from the offense that was the object of the conspiracy. Conspiracy is complete without commission of the offense. Count two of the superseding indictment charges that the conspiracy existed from in or about July 2016 through on or about August 29, 2018. The Government need not prove that the conspiracy started or ended on or about those specific It is sufficient if you find in fact that the charge conspiracy was formed and existed for some time within the period set forth in the superseding indictment. The conspiracy ends when the objectives of the conspiracy have been achieved or when all members of the conspiracy have withdrawn from it. However, a conspiracy may be a continuing conspiracy and, if it is, it lasts until there is some affirmative showing that it has ended or that all its members have withdrawn. A conspiracy may be a continuing one if the agreement includes an understanding that the conspiracy will continue over time. Also, a conspiracy may have a continuing purpose or objective, and therefore may be a continuing conspiracy.

Evidence has been admitted in this case that certain

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

persons who are alleged to be co-conspirators of the Defendant did or said certain things. The acts or statements of any member of a conspiracy are treated as acts or statements of all the members of the conspiracy even if these acts or statements were performed or spoken during the existence of the conspiracy and to further the objective of Therefore, you may consider as evidence the conspiracy. against the Defendant any acts done or statements made by any members of the conspiracy during the existence of and to further the objectives of the conspiracy. You may consider these facts and statements, even if they were done and made in the Defendant's absence and without his knowledge. with all the evidence presented in this case, it is for you to decide whether you believe this evidence, and how much weight to give it. Acts done or statements made by an alleged co-conspirator before the Defendant joined the allowed -- the alleged conspiracy, may also be considered by you as evidence against the Defendant. However, acts done or statements made before the alleged conspiracy began or after it ended may only be considered by you as evidence against the person who performed that act or made that statement. Members of the jury, upon the conclusion of my instructions, you will retire to consider your verdict. Your verdict on each count must be unanimous. That is, all jurors must In reaching your verdict, you must determine the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

facts from all the testimony you have received and from all the other evidence which has been received during the trial. You are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts. Neither I nor anyone else may infringe upon your responsibility in that area. You must, however, accept the Rules of Law as I have given them to you whether you agree with them or not, and then apply the law as I have stated it to the facts that you find.

Your attitude and conduct at the outset of your deliberations are matters of considerable importance. you return to the jury room, your deliberations should begin and proceed in an orderly fashion. Your first order of business is to elect a foreperson. Now, you may choose any one of your number as the foreperson, but I want to emphasize that that person's vote, views, and opinions, are entitled to no greater weight than any other juror. The same is true of notetaking. Perhaps some of you have taken notes and others. have not. Merely because a juror has taken notes does not mean that those notes are accurate or that the person taking the notes has a superior recollection of the evidence. are not entitled to any greater weight than an individual juror's recollection, and the recollection of the juror who was taking notes is not entitled to any greater weight simply because he or she took notes than is the recollection of a juror whose memory is not supported by notes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If, in the course of your deliberations you have any further questions or should find yourself in serious doubt concerning some portions of my instructions to you about the law, I'm not suggesting that you will, but if you do, it is your privilege to return to the courtroom for further clarification. In that event, you should first transmit, through Deputy Clerk, Ms. Kristin Makely, a note to me signed by your foreperson. None of you should attempt to communicate with me by any other means than a note signed by the foreperson. I will not communicate with you on any subject touching the merits of the case other than in writing or orally here in open court. Any writing from me to you or from you to me will be shared with Counsel. At no time during your deliberations should you reveal, even to me, how you may stand numerically on any question before you. cannot happen until you have reached a unanimous verdict. Your function, members of the jury, is to reach a fair conclusion from the evidence and the applicable law. It is an extremely important function. Your verdict should be reached only after careful and thorough deliberation. course of that deliberation, you should talk to each other, consult with each other, discuss the evidence, discuss the reasonable inferences to be drawn from the evidence, and you should do all of this in a sincere effort to arrive at a just verdict. It is your duty to consider the issues with a view

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

toward reaching an agreement on a verdict if you can do so without violating your individual judgment and conscience. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, examining the issues and evidence with candor and frankness, and with proper deference to each other and proper regard for the opinions of each other. Mature consideration requires that you be willing to re-examine your own views and to change your opinion if convinced that it lacks merit or validity. While maintaining this flexibility, you are not required to surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effective evidence solely because of another juror's opinion or merely for the purpose of returning a unanimous verdict. Keep in mind, and I know you will, that this is a most serious offense. The parties' Counsel and I rely upon you to give full and conscientious deliberation and consideration to the issues and evidence before you. You should not be influence by anything other than law and the evidence in this Each of the parties stands equal before The Court. Each of them is entitled to the same fair and impartial treatment at your hands.

The verdict sheet in this case is a paper setting out the name of the Defendant, together with a line for guilty and a line for not guilty on each count. That is where you will record your verdict, either guilty or not guilty. For your convenience, each of you will have a copy

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the verdict sheet. Normally, however, only one verdict sheet will be filled out. That should be filled out and signed by the foreperson. As I have previously stated, your verdict should be unanimous.

Members of the jury, I want to review now with the verdict form. It has two paragraphs. One, count one of the superseding indictment charges the Defendant, Sharif El-Battouty, with engaging in a child exploitation enterprise from in or about July 2016 through in or about August 2018. We, the jury, unanimously find the Defendant, Sharif El-Battouty, and then there's a place for you to check either quilty or not guilty. When you have concluded your deliberations on count one, the verdict form then says proceed to question two, which states count two of the superseding indictment charges the Defendant, Sharif El-Battouty, with conspiracy to advertise child pornography from in or about July 2016 through in or about August 29, 2018. We, the jury, unanimously find the Defendant, Sharif El-Battouty, and then you will fill in guilty or not guilty. Then there's a place for the signature of the foreperson and the date.

My I see Counsel at sidebar?

(Sidebar discussion occurred at 12:38 p.m.)

THE COURT: Jane? Any objections to the charge for the Defendant?

MR. LEE: Yes. Please note my objection to 1 paragraph 67, which relates to the proposed jury charge that 2 is submitted to the Court on the meeting of the in-concert 3 provision in count one. Your Honor, with respect to the 4 5 paragraph --THE COURT: I will allow --6 7 MR. LEE: I'm sorry. THE COURT: -- that you have objected to the way you 8 calculate the number. 9 MR. LEE: Correct. 10 THE COURT: Yeah. The objection's overruled. 11 MR. LEE: Okay. Your Honor, in para 18, which is 12 the reasonable doubt paragraph --13 THE COURT: Yeah. 14 MR. LEE: You -- there was one word you mis --15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. LEE: -- spoke on. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Alright. What did I say? 18 MR. LEE: I can show you. You said convinced --19 THE COURT: Alright. 20 MR. LEE: -- instead of convicted. 21 THE COURT: Let me reread that. 22 MR. LEE: Could you reread the whole paragraph? 23 THE COURT: I don't think it necessary. I'll start 24 with reasonable doubt, it's not that (indiscernible). 25

MR. LEE: Okay.

THE COURT: Alright. Any objections

(indiscernible). Alright, I will make that correct and tell
the jury that they'll be getting a copy of the charge, unless
(indiscernible).

MR. LEE: One other item, Your Honor. The Government has prepared the laptop computer --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LEE: -- to go back. I've reviewed it, so I'm comfortable with -- subject to objection, which you understand.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. LEE: I'm comfortable with the laptop in its current form that's going to go back to the jury, but I wonder if you could instruct the jury that they should only look at -- and by the way, we've wiped off all the other files on the computer, just the exhibits. But I would request that you instruct the jury that they are not to do anything else on the laptop other than look at the exhibits, and my primary concern is I wouldn't want them to access the internet and do any kind of research.

THE COURT: Alright. Well, I'll certainly tell them.

MR. LEE: Okay, thank you.

(Sidebar discussion concluded at 12:41 p.m.)

THE COURT: Members of the jury, you may be happy to know that you will each be getting a copy of my instructions, which I've read for the last hour, so you'll each have that, and you'll also -- for your reference. And you will also have a copy of the verdict sheet, although only one verdict sheet should be filled out.

Now, I read this charge for about an hour, and Counsel has informed me that I misread a sentence, so I want to correct that now. But I'll read several sentences around it. Reasonable doubt is doubt which appeals to your reason, to your judgment, to your common sense, and to your experience. It is not caprice or whim or speculation. It is not an excuse to avoid the performance of an unpleasant duty. A Defendant may not be convicted based on suspicion or conjecture, but only on evidence proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Members of the jury, the case is now in your hands, and your first obligation will be to elect the foreperson, and any one of you can serve as the foreperson. You will also be receiving a laptop which contains all the exhibits in the case. You will have that for your reference. Now, obviously you are to use the laptop only to look at the exhibits. You're not to do any research on it, to use it for any other purpose, and I think that's pretty obvious. I'm sure you would not do that. And I'm sure your lunch is

there, if it hasn't already arrived. The case is now in your 1 hands for deliberation. But before we retire, is there a 2 security officer here? Ms. Makely, will you please affirm 3 him? Please raise your right hand. Do you 5 MS. MAKELY: 6 swear or affirm that you will keep this jury in a quiet, convenient place for their deliberations, and that you will 7 8 allow no one to speak to them or speak to them yourself touching the issue before them unless it is to inquire if 9 they have agreed upon the verdict? Do you solemnly swear? 10 SECURITY GUARD: I do. 11 12 MS. MAKELY: Thank you. THE COURT: Before we retire, the alternate jurors 13 will not be deliberating with the jury. Ms. Makely has a 14 comfortable location for you, and you're free to talk about 15 anything in the world you want to talk about except the case. 16 Please do not discuss the case while you are together. Thank 17 you very much. 18 MS. MAKELY: All rise. 19 (Jury out at 12:43 p.m.) 20 (Recess at 2:43 p.m., until 2:18 p.m.) 21 THE COURT: May I see Counsel? John, you need to 22 get the copies of the charge and (indiscernible). 23 (Jury in at 2:18 p.m.) 24 MS. MAKELY: Court is now in session. 25

THE COURT: You may be seated. Will the foreperson 1 please rise. Has the jury reached a verdict? 2 3 FOREPERSON: Yes. THE COURT: May I see the verdict sheet, please? 4 5 Ms. Makely, will you please take the verdict? MS. MAKELY: On Bill of Indictment Number 18-352, 6 Defendant 3, between the United States of America and Sharif 7 El-Battouty, as to count one, do you find the Defendant 8 9 quilty or not guilty? FOREPERSON: Guilty. 10 MS. MAKELY: As to count two, do you find the 11 Defendant guilty or not guilty? 12 FOREPERSON: Guilty. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Anything further from 14 Counsel at this time? 15 MR. SCHLESSINGER: Not from the Government, Your 16 17 Honor. MR. LEE: Nothing, Your Honor. 18 Thank you. Members of the jury, I want THE COURT: 19 to thank you very much for your service in this matter. I 20 will meet you in the jury room to say goodbye. 21 MS. MAKELY: All rise. 22 (Jury excused at 12:20 p.m.) 23 THE COURT: We'll give Counsel a date for 24 sentencing, which will probably be sometime in September, 25

because we need to get the (indiscernible). Alright, thank you very much and good luck to everyone. And Ms. Shoop, good luck to you on July 5th.

MS. SHOOP: Thank you, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

MR. LEE: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Court adjourned at 2:23 p.m.)

## CERTIFICATE

I, Stephanie Garcia, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

June 24, 2019